

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-2436**

---

TAMMY CAMPBELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner, Social Security  
Administration,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr.,  
District Judge. (3:12-cv-00623-JAG)

---

Submitted: July 31, 2014

Decided: August 22, 2014

---

Before KEENAN, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Bruce K. Billman, Fredericksburg, Virginia, for Appellant. Nora  
Koch, Acting Regional Chief Counsel, Victor Pane, Supervisory  
Attorney, Maija DiDomenico, Assistant Regional Counsel, SOCIAL  
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Dana J.  
Boente, United States Attorney, Jonathan H. Hambrick, Assistant  
United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tammy Campbell appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to uphold the Commissioner's denial of Campbell's application for disability insurance benefits. Our review of the Commissioner's disability determination is limited to evaluating whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence and whether the correct law was applied. See Johnson v. Barnhart, 434 F.3d 650, 653 (4th Cir. 2005). "Substantial evidence is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). We do not reweigh evidence or make credibility determinations in evaluating whether a decision is supported by substantial evidence; "[w]here conflicting evidence allows reasonable minds to differ as to whether a claimant is disabled," we defer to the Commissioner's decision. Id. (internal quotation marks omitted).

Against this framework, we have thoroughly reviewed the parties' briefs, the administrative record, and the joint appendix, and we discern no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Campbell v. Colvin, No. 3:12-cv-00623-JAG (E.D. Va. Oct. 2, 2013). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED